

David J. Bradley, Clerk

101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124 125 126 127 128 129 130 131 132 133 134 135 136 137 138 139 140 141 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159 160 161 162 163 164 165 166 167 168 169 170 171 172 173 174 175 176 177 178 179 180 181 182 183 184 185 186 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200 201 202 203 204 205 206 207 208 209 210 211 212 213 214 215 216 217 218 219 220 221 222 223 224 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281 282 283 284 285 286 287 288 289 290 291 292 293 294 295 296 297 298 299 300 301 302 303 304 305 306 307 308 309 310 311 312 313 314 315 316 317 318 319 320 321 322 323 324 325 326 327 328 329 330 331 332 333 334 335 336 337 338 339 340 341 342 343 344 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 352 353 354 355 356 357 358 359 360 361 362 363 364 365 366 367 368 369 370 371 372 373 374 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 386 387 388 389 390 391 392 393 394 395 396 397 398 399 400 401 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 409 410 411 412 413 414 415 416 417 418 419 420 421 422 423 424 425 426 427 428 429 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440 441 442 443 444 445 446 447 448 449 450 451 452 453 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 466 467 468 469 470 471 472 473 474 475 476 477 478 479 480 481 482 483 484 485 486 487 488 489 490 491 492 493 494 495 496 497 498 499 500 501 502 503 504 505 506 507 508 509 510 511 512 513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551 552 553 554 555 556 557 558 559 560 561 562 563 564 565 566 567 568 569 570 571 572 573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580 581 582 583 584 585 586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594 595 596 597 598 599 600 601 602 603 604 605 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615 616 617 618 619 620 621 622 623 624 625 626 627 628 629 630 631 632 633 634 635 636 637 638 639 640 641 642 643 644 645 646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666 667 668 669 670 671 672 673 674 675 676 677 678 679 680 681 682 683 684 685 686 687 688 689 690 691 692 693 694 695 696 697 698 699 700 701 702 703 704 705 706 707 708 709 710 711 712 713 714 715 716 717 718 719 720 721 722 723 724 725 726 727 728 729 730 731 732 733 734 735 736 737 738 739 740 741 742 743 744 745 746 747 748 749 750 751 752 753 754 755 756 757 758 759 760 761 762 763 764 765 766 767 768 769 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 779 780 781 782 783 784 785 786 787 788 789 790 791 792 793 794 795 796 797 798 799 800 801 802 803 804 805 806 807 808 809 810 811 812 813 814 815 816 817 818 819 820 821 822 823 824 825 826 827 828 829 830 831 832 833 834 835 836 837 838 839 840 841 842 843 844 845 846 847 848 849 850 851 852 853 854 855 856 857 858 859 860 861 862 863 864 865 866 867 868 869 870 871 872 873 874 875 876 877 878 879 880 881 882 883 884 885 886 887 888 889 890 891 892 893 894 895 896 897 898 899 900 901 902 903 904 905 906 907 908 909 910 911 912 913 914 915 916 917 918 919 920 921 922 923 924 925 926 927 928 929 930 931 932 933 934 935 936 937 938 939 940 941 942 943 944 945 946 947 948 949 950 951 952 953 954 955 956 957 958 959 960 961 962 963 964 965 966 967 968 969 970 971 972 973 974 975 976 977 978 979 980 981 982 983 984 985 986 987 988 989 990 991 992 993 994 995 996 997 998 999 1000 1001 1002 1003 1004 1005 1006 1007 1008 1009 1010 1011 1012 1013 1014 1015 1016 1017 1018 1019 1020 1021 1022 1023 1024 1025 1026 1027 1028 1029 1030 1031 1032 1033 1034 1035 1036 1037 1038 1039 1040 1041 1042 1043 1044 1045 1046 1047 1048 1049 1050 1051 1052 1053 1054 1055 1056 1057 1058 1059 1060 1061 1062 1063 1064 1065 1066 1067 1068 1069 1070 1071 1072 1073 1074 1075 1076 1077 1078 1079 1080 1081 1082 1083 1084 1085 1086 1087 1088 1089 1090 1091 1092 1093 1094 1095 1096 1097 1098

¹Complaint, Docket Entry No. 1, p. 4 ¶¶ 11-12. All page numbers for docket entries in the record refer to the pagination inserted at the top of the page by the court's electronic filing system, CM/ECF.

August of 2017.² Shortly after the hurricane Plaintiff hired a flood remediation service to restore the property.³ Plaintiff then sought reimbursement for the costs it incurred through its flood insurance policies issued by Defendant.⁴

Plaintiff's policy is a Standard Flood Insurance Policy ("SFIP") under the National Flood Insurance Program ("NFIP") created by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and regulated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency ["FEMA"].⁵ See Gallup v. Omaha Property and Casualty Insurance Co., 434 F.3d 341, 342 (5th Cir. 2005) (summarizing the legal mechanics of the NFIP). The SFIP is "a regulation of [FEMA], stating the conditions under which federal flood-insurance funds may be disbursed." Marseilles Homeowners Condominium Association Inc. v. Fidelity National Insurance Co., 542 F.3d 1053, 1054 (5th Cir. 2008). The terms of the SFIP's General Property Form are promulgated by FEMA and published in the Code of Federal Regulations. See 44 C.F.R. 61, App. A(2). The SFIP requires policyholders to submit proof of loss to the carrier within 60 days, and compliance is a condition

²Id. at 2 ¶ 5.

³Id. at 2-3 ¶¶ 6-7.

⁴Id. at 3-4 ¶¶ 7-9.

⁵Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff, Northgate Country Club Management, LLC's Response to Philadelphia Indemnity Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment ("Plaintiff's Memorandum in Support of Response"), attachment 1 to Plaintiff, Northgate Country Club Management, LLC's Response to Philadelphia Indemnity Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment ("Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's MSJ"), Docket Entry No. 16-1, p. 3.

precedent to any lawsuit for an amount allegedly owed under the policy. 44 C.F.R. 61, App. A(2), Arts. VII(J)(4), VII(R). See Gowland v. Aetna, 143 F.3d 951, 954 (5th Cir. 1998) (holding that a federal flood insurance claim is barred if a plaintiff does not satisfy the proof-of-loss requirement). In the wake of Hurricane Harvey, however, FEMA waived the 60-day deadline and imposed a 365-day deadline instead.⁶ It is undisputed that Plaintiff did not submit any proof of loss before or after these deadlines.⁷

Although no proof of loss was submitted, Defendant acknowledged Plaintiff's claims under the policy and assigned an independent adjuster.⁸ After assessing the adjuster's estimates, Defendant paid \$1,036,884.08 on Plaintiff's policies in November and December of 2017.⁹ These payments fell short of the total billed to Plaintiff by the remediation service.¹⁰ Defendant was notified of this discrepancy. In February of 2018 the adjuster

⁶FEMA Memorandum, Exhibit A to Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's MSJ, Docket Entry No. 16-2, p. 5.

⁷See Affidavit of J. Scott Lapine, Exhibit A to Defendant's MSJ, Docket Entry No. 13-2, pp. 5-6 ¶¶ 16-17 (stating that Plaintiff did not submit any proof of loss); Plaintiff's Memorandum in Support of Response, Docket Entry No. 16-1, attachment 1 to Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's MSJ, pp. 3-5 (arguing that the proof-of-loss requirement was waived by either FEMA or Defendant, not that it was satisfied).

⁸Complaint, Docket Entry No. 1, p. 3 ¶¶ 7-8.

⁹Flood Claim Response Letters, Exhibit G to Defendant's MSJ, Docket Entry No. 13-2, pp. 169-175.

¹⁰Complaint, Docket Entry No. 1, p. 3 ¶ 7.

submitted to Defendant at least one supplemental report stating that Plaintiff had hired the remediation service and that detailed information about those services had not been provided.¹¹ Defendant did not pay any more to Plaintiff under the policy.¹²

On January 14, 2019, Plaintiff filed this action to recover the difference between the amount paid and the amount it owed for the remediation service.¹³ On January 10, 2020, Defendant filed its Motion for Summary Judgment on the grounds that Plaintiff's lawsuit was barred by a failure to submit proof of loss for its claims.¹⁴ Plaintiff filed its response on April 24, 2020,¹⁵ and Defendant replied on May 1, 2020.¹⁶

II. Standard of Review

Summary judgment is appropriate if the movant establishes that there is no genuine dispute about any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). Disputes about material facts are genuine "if the evidence is such

¹¹See Colonial Claims Supplement #87051524582017, Exhibit D-3 to Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's MSJ, Docket Entry No. 16-2, pp. 99-100.

¹²Complaint, Docket Entry No. 1, p. 3 ¶ 8.

¹³Id. at 1.

¹⁴Defendant's MSJ, Docket Entry No. 13.

¹⁵Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's MSJ, Docket Entry No. 16.

¹⁶Defendant's Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, Docket Entry No. 17.

that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party." Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 106 S. Ct. 2505, 2510 (1986). The moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law if "the nonmoving party has failed to make a sufficient showing on an essential element of her case with respect to which she has the burden of proof." Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 106 S. Ct. 2548, 2552 (1986).

A party moving for summary judgment "must 'demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of material fact,' but need not *negate* the elements of the nonmovant's case." Little v. Liquid Air Corp., 37 F.3d 1069, 1075 (5th Cir. 1994) (en banc) (per curiam) (quoting Celotex, 106 S. Ct. at 2553). "If the moving party fails to meet this initial burden, the motion must be denied, regardless of the nonmovant's response." Id. If the moving party meets this burden, Rule 56(c) requires the nonmovant to go beyond the pleadings and show by affidavits, depositions, answers to interrogatories, admissions on file, or other admissible evidence that specific facts exist over which there is a genuine issue for trial. Id. The nonmovant "must do more than simply show that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the material facts." Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 106 S. Ct. 1348, 1356 (1986).

In reviewing the evidence "the court must draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party, and it may not make credibility determinations or weigh the evidence." Reeves v.

Sanderson Plumbing Products, Inc., 120 S. Ct. 2097, 2110 (2000). The court resolves factual controversies in favor of the nonmovant, "but only when there is an actual controversy, that is, when both parties have submitted evidence of contradictory facts." Little, 37 F.3d at 1075.

III. Analysis

Defendant contends that Plaintiff's claims fail as a matter of law because of the failure to comply with the SFIP's proof-of-loss requirement.¹⁷ Plaintiff acknowledges that it did not submit proof of loss. Plaintiff argues that (1) FEMA waived the proof-of-loss requirement, and (2) Defendant waived the requirement by processing the initial claims without a proof-of-loss.¹⁸

Plaintiff cites FEMA press releases in support of its argument that FEMA waived the requirement. In a memo dated September 3, 2017, the FEMA administrator announced that:

To allow enough time for policyholders to evaluate their losses and the adjusters' reports, I am waiving the sixty (60)-day proof of loss deadline requirement. The deadline for submitting a compliant proof of loss for Hurricane Harvey is 365 days (one year) from the date of loss.¹⁹

¹⁷Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment on Behalf of Philadelphia Indemnity Insurance Company, attachment 1 to Defendant's MSJ, Docket Entry No. 13-1, pp. 7-8.

¹⁸Plaintiff's Memorandum in Support of Response, attachment 1 to Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's MSJ, Docket Entry No. 16-1, pp. 3-5.

¹⁹FEMA Memorandum, Exhibit A to Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's MSJ, Docket Entry No. 16-2, p. 5.

On August 27, 2018, FEMA announced that it would not further extend the deadline, but that "[p]olicyholders should continue to work with their insurers, and the NFIP will pay all proved and agreed-to claims, even after the deadline."²⁰ The announcement specified, however, that "[e]ven after the one year Proof of Loss deadline, policyholders [needed] . . . to submit a Proof of Loss if the policyholder" was "not satisfied with their payment."²¹ These statements do not establish waiver of the proof-of-loss requirement. See Marseilles, 542 F.3d at 1057 (holding that an extension of the proof-of-loss deadline did not waive it as a pre-suit requirement). Moreover, the documents explicitly state that policyholders must still submit a proof of loss. Plaintiff's argument that the documents indicate FEMA waived the requirement lacks merit.

Alternatively, Plaintiff argues that there is at least a question as to whether Defendant waived the proof-of-loss requirement because Defendant made its initial payments based on the adjuster's report without proof of loss and the adjuster submitted supplemental reports. This argument misunderstands Defendant's role as an agent of the federal government in administering the NFIP. Because the NFIP is a federal program implicating federal funds, a person seeking those funds is

²⁰FEMA Press Release HQ-18-107, Exhibit B to Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's MSJ, Docket Entry No. 16-2, p. 7.

²¹Id.


obligated to be familiar with the legal requirements for their receipt. Wright v. Allstate Insurance Co., 415 F.3d 384, 389 (5th Cir. 2005). "The terms of the SFIP are dictated by FEMA, and cannot be waived or modified by [the private carrier]." Id. Because Defendant lacked the legal ability to waive the SFIP's proof-of-loss requirement, Plaintiff cannot show waiver by pointing to Defendant's conduct.

Articles VII(J) and VII(R) of the SFIP operate as a strict requirement that precludes suit if no proof of loss is submitted. Ferraro v. Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Co., 796 F.3d 529, 532 (5th Cir. 2015). Because Plaintiff does not dispute that it failed to meet this requirement and its legal arguments as to waiver lack merit, the court will grant Defendant's MSJ. See id. at 534.

IV. Conclusion and Order

For the reasons explained above, the court concludes that Plaintiff has not met the conditions required under the Standard Flood Insurance Plan to bring this action against Defendant. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment on Behalf of Philadelphia Indemnity Insurance Company (Docket Entry No. 13) is therefore **GRANTED**.

SIGNED at Houston, Texas, on this the 16th day of June, 2020.



SIM LAKE
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE